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This is a report from our pre-conference workshop held at Sovereign Hill, Ballarat in September 2004. The workshop was for people interested in extending their appreciation of how to use type concepts in teams and organisations, and for those committed to enhancing the capacity of their workgroup and their own capacity to work with others.

The workshop was designed to make visible the differences in the ways we take in information. Some people perceive in a detailed way (sensing), others in a general way (intuition). These differences contribute to communication gaps and blocks.

The workshop was presented by the four co-authors. The 19 participants were not evenly balanced, with 4 Ss to 15 Ns (type table, page 22). This did however provide opportunities to learn, and opportunities for participants to experience the differences first-hand, and to develop useful strategies for overcoming communication blocks and differences in their workplaces.

The team had planned a first workshop to explore this field in 2003 with members of AusAPT's Victorian region. A report of our findings, 'Exploring the S-N Chasm', was presented at AusAPT's 2004 conference at Sovereign Hill, and was also given to all participants of the one-day workshop.

We developed the workshop, using an approach suggested by Chuck Pratt, to illustrate differences between S and N perceptions with regard to:

- time perception and orientation;
- their relationship to, and comfort with, boundaries in the workplace, and
- the data that interests them.

We opened the workshop with an overview of the MBTI dichotomies, explaining that our focus would be on S-N. Sue used the dichotomy definitions from Roger Pearman's The Leadership Advantage.

Sensing and Intuition: Opposite ways of taking in information and making observations: through either the realism of the senses, or patterns and layers of possibilities informed by the senses.

Sensing types pay attention to practical facts, details, past and present realities, specific outcomes. Intuitive types pay attention to insights, ideas, possibilities and patterns.

Time perception and orientation

The intention of this session, facilitated by Elwin, was to explore how Ss and Ns each perceive and orient themselves to 'time'.

After a reminder that 'information gathering is a process of describing things, not evaluating them' (Kroeger & Thuesen), Elwin asked participants to please draw 'time'.

We allowed 15 minutes, expecting the Ss to take about 5 minutes, while most of the Ns would still be drawing or thinking about the task when the time was up. However, this was not the case. All of the participants finished quickly, and there was a sea of expectant faces waiting further instructions.

The fallback was to give this instruction (normally given only to Ss to fill in whilst waiting for Ns to finish) to everyone:

Completely on your own, write a few sentences about your personal future. This will take 3 minutes.
On completion, Ian asked the group to estimate how long they had been working on the given tasks. There was a clock in the room. One N-preferring participant asked, ‘What does Ian think the time was?’ Ian’s answer: ‘Exactly 15 minutes.’

The examples of the S and N drawings at left illustrate their clearly differing styles of representing time.

The SJ’s drawings all included a clock face or a picture of the time on an analogue or digital clock. The ISTJ’s drawing at left clearly represents the concept of time as ‘a moment in time captured on a clock face.’

One SP drew a spiral. The other drew a straight line, with ‘start’ at one end, and the finish shortly before the other end—with an arrow to indicate it was ongoing.

The S-preferring participants all used only one colour, except for one SJ, who used black for the circle of the clock and blue for the numbers.

The Ns’ drawings were mainly abstract creations and markedly different, not only from the Ss’ exhibits, but also from each other. Colour featured on most pages, and some incorporated writing about their personal futures.

The ENTJ’s drawing (left) is a clear example of the concept of time as infinite, with the spirals showing movement across time.

We left the drawings up on the walls all day, allowing the differences to be seen again and again. These were still being discussed at afternoon tea.

As a good example of how S and N are like two different languages, where the interpretation of the idea is so different (Ferrand 1997:81), this exercise had a great impact on participants.

A correlation can be seen between these drawings and the verbal descriptions of time in Otto Kroeger and Janet Thuesen’s Type Talk. In Table 1, reproduced from Type Talk, only one term, ‘short’, appears in both the S and N lists. Notice also how the Ss produce a longer list of terms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intuitives</th>
<th>Sensors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>infinite</td>
<td>minute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forever</td>
<td>year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eternal</td>
<td>productive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waves</td>
<td>sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fleeting</td>
<td>wake-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short</td>
<td>decade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linear</td>
<td>night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forward</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constraint</td>
<td>century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flowing</td>
<td>no time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measured</td>
<td>past (ancient)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intangible</td>
<td>season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>external</td>
<td>meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abstract</td>
<td>future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cosmic</td>
<td>calendar year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finite</td>
<td>time to go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defined</td>
<td>holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tic toc</td>
<td>vacation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time of day</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time to listen</td>
<td>reflective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relax</td>
<td>free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wasted</td>
<td>class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party</td>
<td>clock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time ticking</td>
<td>calendar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>away</td>
<td>schedule</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kroeger & Thuesen 1988, Type Talk, p 90-91

After reflecting on why this ‘time’ segment was so different from the other times she has facilitated it, Elwin has concluded that working in a theme park, as opposed to a venue expressly designed for training and learning, disadvantaged the group.

As the room was not big enough for participants to move about freely, Elwin forgot to initiate small-group sharing. The large group self-organised, displaying and speaking about their artefacts, and taking questions from the whole group, while adding to the body of knowledge in the room by sharing their own ‘time’-related practices as MBTI group facilitators.

Our results from these exercises again highlighted the marked differences in how Ss and Ns perceive and orient themselves to time.
Ease and comfort with boundaries

Pamela introduced this activity, grouping participants by their perceiving (S or N) and lifestyle (J or P) preferences. The groups were asked to consider:

- how they 'see' boundaries, and
- their ease or comfort with boundaries in their job roles, work spaces, team memberships, scope of influence, project planning, organisational structure, and organisational traditions.

The results of this activity are reproduced in Table 2 over the page.

SJ (characterised by introverted sensing)

The MBTI Manual describes SJ types as 'realistic decision-makers' who seek order in their environment. They are organised, dependable and conservative. They tend to solve problems by reliance on past experience and they dislike ambiguity.

Our SJ group like clarity and transparency in job roles. They emphasised that they are tolerant of boundaries and try to work within established guidelines. For the SJs there is little doubt about who is in charge: the boss drives the agenda, and they respect that authority. Notice that the SJs see team membership as a way of getting to the top.

SP (characterised by extraverted sensing)

The MBTI Manual describes SP types as 'adaptable realists' seeking new experiences in the present moment. They are curious about the world around them. They adapt to situations as they arrive and they are good observers of the immediate situation.

Our SP group responded only to the first four elements. It seems they did have time for the others. They stressed their need for flexibility in work roles and their frustration with fixed structures.

The SPs can be rebellious in some team situations, particularly where a poor team has been picked. This is related to their feelings of being ignored and frustrated when others curtail their scope of influence.

NJ (characterised by introverted intuition)

The MBTI Manual describes NJ types as 'visionary decision-makers' who strive to accomplish the goals of their inner visions. They are driving, persistent and determined.

The NJs feel free to adapt their job to suit themselves so that they feel comfortable. Thus, boundaries are flexible and best set by themselves.

The NJs recognise the need to consciously take into account the needs of co-workers, and believe that functional cohesion is a worthy goal in teams. They are not content, however, to take on responsibilities without questioning, and regard established positions as needing to be challenged. They relish opportunities to influence others, and want this influence to be broad and deep.

NP (characterised by extraverted intuition)

The MBTI Manual describes NP types as 'adaptable innovators' who constantly seek to challenge the new: new ideas, new people, new possibilities, with an aim of changing and reshaping the environment. They are unconventional spirits who hate to be fenced in.

In this activity we had sufficient numbers to form two NP groups, with preferences for thinking (NTP) and feeling (NFP).

The NTP group do not like the structures provided and create their own. Generally they work best in unstructured roles that are free of inflexible deadlines. 'Everything is negotiable', and they need the freedom to change their minds as circumstances change. They desire logical explanations, and resist any tendency to blindly follow what has gone on in the past.

Pamela Fitzpatrick (INTP) uses the MBTI in leadership development and transformative coaching to help her clients better understand themselves, and to enhance their communication, problem-solving and relationship-building skills.

Pamela’s work is informed by postgraduate studies in leadership, management and anthropology, and rich experience in professional development and overseas aid in Australia and Central America.
Table 2: Group responses to the questions 'How do you “see” boundaries?', 'Ease or comfort in ...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SJ</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>NJ</th>
<th>NTP</th>
<th>NFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job role</strong></td>
<td>Clear, accountability,</td>
<td>(small group –</td>
<td>Adapt to suit selves</td>
<td>(ignored structure)</td>
<td>Imposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transparent,</td>
<td>identification</td>
<td>Feel comfortable</td>
<td>Constrictions</td>
<td>Create own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transparent</td>
<td>similarities)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Variety needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grey parts inhibit</td>
<td>Flexibility needed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change</td>
<td>Ease when its flexible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can initiate</td>
<td>Cpposite: frustrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Take inititive to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complete vagueness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work space</strong></td>
<td>Transparent</td>
<td>Tried to define</td>
<td>Need space to get</td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Some ownership /</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geographic when you</td>
<td></td>
<td>job done</td>
<td>OK to change mind</td>
<td>some not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>travel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Need things at hand</td>
<td>Freedom</td>
<td>Tidiness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>accessible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Know where things are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team membership</strong></td>
<td>Rebels in situation</td>
<td>In a position of</td>
<td>Everything is</td>
<td>Bias toward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>influence, conscious</td>
<td>negotiable</td>
<td>leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of needing relating to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Functional cohesion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>important for more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scope of influence</strong></td>
<td>Others influence:</td>
<td>Some influence, only</td>
<td>Wide, broad and</td>
<td>Happy to influence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>project set-up</td>
<td>when confirmed to group.</td>
<td>deep as possible</td>
<td>others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>treat in teams</td>
<td>(ignored, frustrated,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rebellious</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Couldn’t be bothered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project planning</strong></td>
<td>Constraints –</td>
<td>Big picture</td>
<td>(Boundaries: valuing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>outcomes/</td>
<td>Take forward</td>
<td>the person)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>success structure</td>
<td>Thinking/ planning:</td>
<td>Organisational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plans</td>
<td>just &amp; what</td>
<td>collaboration and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What? How?</td>
<td></td>
<td>planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Limited opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td>Finalise up to the end</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fly by seat of pants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Others don’t know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational structure</strong></td>
<td>Transparent</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>Shape boundaries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boss drives agenda</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>internally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational efficiency</td>
<td>Positions are there</td>
<td>Negotiable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- political agenda</td>
<td>to be challenged</td>
<td>Logical explanation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Depend on people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational traditions</strong></td>
<td>Can limit</td>
<td>Blind following is</td>
<td>Work in organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not on</td>
<td>and then disappear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Structure – broad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>enough to work around</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The NFP group tend to fly by the seat of their pants. They are often employed in roles in which they come into an organisation, provide a required service, and then disappear. They are happy to create their own roles, and need a variety of possibilities.

The NFPs want to be brave enough to work around boundaries set by others, and are very happy to be able to influence others.

This activity provoked a series of different responses, depending on the perceiving and lifestyle preferences. The SJs are relatively happy to work within boundaries, but the other groups felt more comfortable when more flexibility was possible.

**Differences in the data that interests S and N types**

Ian introduced this session, which aimed to explore the differences in the data that interest people with S and N perceiving preferences. To this we added differences on the judging preference, T or F. Thus, the exercise was set in four functional-type groupings.

To create a multi-sensory environment and induce a mood for reflection, we had set up the room with posters of recent movies and had movie theme music playing in the background.

Ian introduced the activity by referring to four of the characters in Gone With The Wind who had been identified as differing on the S-N preference. Ian set out some of the evidence, using Glaeg’s ideas of Rhett Butler and Scarlett O’Hara as hard, practical realists (sensing types), and Ashley Wilkes and Melanie Hamilton as two noble, tender idealists (intuitive types).

Ian also referred to Gone With The Wind as a journey to wholeness, illustrating the transformation of Scarlett’s relationships with the other main characters through her three marriages, showing the steps she takes towards individuation.

We then moved into functional-pair groups with the following instructions:

In your group, we want you to consider the movies that were special for you, and to think about what appealed to you about each one.

At the conclusion we would like each group to report back about the themes discussed, and to tell the group which movies were on the list, and what appealed about them.

**ST: Sensing with Thinking**

Often described as practical and matter-of-fact, STs can be expected to like using their abilities in technical skills with facts and people.

Film titles presented by the ST group were The Hours, A Beautiful Mind, The Fugitive, Iris, The Power of One, Meet Joe Black and The Matrix.

Themes in the ST choices were films that make one think and are challenging. They like strength of plot development, expression of opinions and development of ideas. The STs are interested in human dynamics and complex characters, and search for hidden meanings. They admire films that show overcoming of adversity, and films that are unconventional.

**SF: Sensing with Feeling**

Described as ‘sympathetic and friendly’, SFs like using their abilities in practical help for and services for people.

As there were no SFs among the workshop participants, an ESFJ guest was invited to join the group for this activity.

Titles listed by our SF guest were Finding Nemo, E T, Forrest Gump, and the Chevy Chase movies. These were listed in the context of going to the movies when one gets a free ticket, and children’s movies seen in family groups. Our SF likes having ‘a happy cry’, and goes to the movies ‘to escape’. Themes that appeal are ‘anything Irish’, and films that are conversions from books. She dislikes war themes, documentaries, and anything ‘upsetting or worrying.’

Ian Ball (ISTJ) has had a long involvement with psychology and education. As well as managing the Psychological Type Research Unit at Deakin University, he conducts school reviews and contributes to a number of research projects.

Ian is a chartered member of the Australian HR Institute, a fellow of the Australian Psychological Society, and a life member of AusAPT.

Contact: gmagpa@bigpond.net.au
NT: Intuition with Thinking

Described as 'logical and imaginative', NTs like using their abilities on theoretical and technical developments.

The 10 NT participants formed two groups, each with a mix of NTJs and NTPs.


Themes in the NTs' choices included epic stories, fantasies and social commentaries; films concerned with breaking conventions and featuring unpredictability; intellectual challenges; and films evoking good versus evil, with characters overcoming odds.

The NTs also like films about empowering of people, archetypical stereotypes, the breaking down of barriers, and generally positive outcomes.

The NTs dislike horror movies and current hits, preferring films that are more 'film festival' than general release. They like films featuring 'credible actors', such as Toni Collette—but not Eddie Murphy, Adam Sandler, Arnold Schwarzenegger and Hugh Grant.

NF: Intuition with Feeling

Described as 'enthusiastic and insightful', NFs like using their abilities in understanding and communicating with people.

Titles presented by the NF group included Chocolat, Gone With The Wind, Lawrence of Arabia, To Kill A Mockingbird, Dances With Wolves, Billy Elliott, On Golden Pond, The Sound Of Music, and The Pianist.

The mentions of On Golden Pond and The Sound of Music drew audible groans from many other participants, but the NFs said they enjoy such movies.

Themes in the NF choices were witnessing change or transformation in the characters; being 'moved' or shifted; and providing an opportunity to connect with feelings in a very ST world. Relationships are important to this group: they do not want to think too much, and would prefer to feel.

Another aspect was the overcoming of obstacles by the characters—heroic in nature. The NFs also indicated an interest in 'gritty cool stuff', which they thought illustrated their chance to experience the senses and to exercise their inferior functions.

It is clear that this activity illustrated sharp differences in 'the data that interests them' across and between the function pairs. It would be difficult to find a title or film genre that appeals to all four of the groups.

What was interesting is that only one title appeared in more than one list. In fact, A Beautiful Mind seemed to be appreciated for different reasons. The STs seemed to be more interested in mental conditions and personality breakdown, while the NTs seemed more interested in character development and unpredictability of outcomes.

The SF and NF groups shared a common interest in the humanity of the characters, and liked movies that 'moved' them. The term 'tear-jerkers' applies to many of their choices. This may indicate that, for these groups, going to the movies is an acceptable form for the release of emotions.

It was evident that the marked differences evoked different emotional reactions in the groups, and might have disturbed some participants. The organisers were sensitive to the handling of the issue of respect for differences, and took up relevant issues in conversations during the next break.

The processing of the rich and complex data from this activity needed to be done after the workshop. The data needs to be considered in the context of illustrating a concept using a common experience—viewing movies. In an organisational situation it may be desirable to change the focus of the discussion and use things about the work setting to illustrate the 'data which interests them.'
Working through strategies

The final workshop session was designed to be integrative. We envisaged that the groups would make use of all the data they had collected during the day. As an introduction, Sue outlined the 'Z' model of problem-solving using type preferences.

The participants formed four mixed groups, each including one person with a preference for sensing. We asked the groups to consider using their S-prefering member to monitor the practicality of their responses to the three questions for discussion.

Each group managed the tasks differently. Their dynamics were very different, too—although we did observe commonalities within the two groups where the S preference was aligned with a preference for judging, and in the two groups where the S was aligned with a perceiving preference.

The groups had 50 minutes for this activity. At the conclusion the groups shared these responses and ideas:

**What will you do differently managing time back in your workplace, for self and for others?**

- Get an S to help Ns
- Pay more attention to 'time' and the awareness that there are different interpretations of time for people
- Stop seeing 'time' in small snatches, but more aggregated
- Checking with everyone we have the same understanding / concept about an agreed time
- Ask for an extension if going to run over time allowed

**What strategies might you use to close the S-N chasm for self and others?**

The scope of this question was possibly too large to interpret and work with.

Group members made general comments at this point. The groups struggled at this stage of the day, although the forms of their struggle appeared quite different in the different groups. Possibly the NPs had lost interest—they had lived through the experience and 'moved on'. Other NPs may have needed a lot more time to process the thinking around the data.

For people quite tired at this point, processing the information became difficult.

The two groups with SJ members resolved this by using stories about something that was not working in their workplaces. Other members gave suggestions, sharing ways the problem could be solved. This appeared to be an analysis going backwards in time, as a particular problem was dissected.

In these groups the SJ mindset controlled the processing and the conversation. Not all of the people were engaged all of the time—and neither SJ appeared to notice. Their focus was intense, and it was hard for the facilitator to attract their attention.

The third group used brainstorming. The three Ns conversed on typical workplace dilemmas, with their SP prompting them to reassess by intervening with 'Get real!' When the SP monitor left early, the group continued his role by using a physical reminder of his presence and his comment.

The fourth group did not appear to engage in the task. It seemed too hard to focus. Perhaps the Ns were very extraverted, which may have added to the difficulty for the SP to work with them in an auditor role.

**How did the S auditor help the group process the different data?**

In our approach to this final task, we had wanted the S role to be validated.

In the SJ groups, the S role dominated or controlled: S combined with J created a lot of structure. The SJs sat in positions central to their groups' physical environment.

The SPs played different roles in their groups: one by being part of a group that had unconsciously decided not to focus; the other by taking on a comfortable role in the group with a specific intervention, which allowed him to exit while the other members reflected and re-assessed.
Feedback from participants

At the end of the workshop, 15 of the 19 participants handed in evaluation sheets.

Respondents said that they enjoyed the workshop (12 'completely' and 3 'almost'); learned something interesting (again, 12 'completely' and 3 'almost'); and, with one exception, learned something of use (10 'completely', 3 'almost', 1 'hardly at all').

The workshop largely met respondents' expectations (3 'completely', 11 'almost'); and most said they would recommend it (7 'completely', 4 'almost', 2 'hardly at all').

In general, participants responded positively to the workshop design and facilitation. They enjoyed the experiential nature of the activities and the personality mix of the presenters and of the group itself. Overall, the richness of the learning provided was appreciated.

There was some criticism of the venue, and three people indicated that they had struggled with the 'data that interests them' (i.e., the movie activity).

Suggestions for improvement were quite varied, and covered some areas that the facilitators would have desired also: e.g., an equal balance of S and N preferences. Unfortunately this was something over which the facilitators had no control.

The struggle in managing the S-N chasm was evident in a desire for 'something to leave here with.' Experiential learning is tiring. Hopefully, integration and reflection time have allowed more 'answers' to occur to those still trying to make sense of parts of the workshop.

Five weeks later, participants were asked the following question via email:

What have you started doing differently in your work or in your life as a result of the workshop day?

Five of the participants responded by email. Their responses are reported opposite.

Post-workshop responses:

What have you started doing differently?

ESTJ: Being more patient with different personality types and trying to communicate in different ways in order to get a desired result, e.g., taking minutes from a meeting and communicating, rather than taking people's word as a commitment.

Being more true to my time, e.g. estimating time to complete tasks taking into account interruptions, rather than the ideal, uninterrupted time. Also walking out of meetings that go over the time limit.

INTP: The workshop reminded me to try to be more specific when instructing S colleagues. I have a new SJ assistant starting with me next Monday, so it will become much more important for me then.

INTP: Firstly, thank you to your S-N chasm team for a good and enjoyable workshop. As a participant it was interesting to have such vastly different facilitators using the same topics in such different ways and styles.

What am I doing differently? Using time differently in my own life. Perhaps giving it true value, instead of treating as a commodity for manipulation. Exploring time in a more constructive sense in my own workshops.

ENFP: I found the workshop fun and reassuring. Because I'm in different organizations as a consultant constantly... I'm well aware of the differences between S & N in the workplace and I never stop learning more whether at a conference, workshop or in real life.

.. not necessarily an S-N reason, but more of a diversity reason, I'm now working on developing workshops with a colleague who is an ISTJ, instead of trying to do it all myself.

I'm also going to Paris with another ISTJ friend who is taking great delight in looking at the seats available on the plane via the website, comparing car rentals, checking hotel accommodation, train fares, etc., whilst I just look forward to the trip. In fact, I don't want to know too much or I won't have any surprises. She assures me she loves that stuff.
One of the participants, an INTP, took up the offer to discuss the workshop with any member of the team. These are Sue's notes of their discussion.

In doing the **time activity**, this INTP initially drew her concept of time, and that was that. Waiting for others to complete the activity, she thought about how she might explain her drawing, so added a title. She wondered in retrospect if this was adoption of S behaviour.

She is very conscious that at her workplace the predominant perceiving type preference is S, and she has been working for almost 12 months to develop as much S communication behaviour as possible. The report of the first workshop stated that Ns do not usually title their drawing work. She had used this page to reference her own memories of the workshop.

One general comment was that she felt validated to be in the company of so many Ns. She has a strong awareness that she is too conceptual. One particular instance of changed behaviour in the workplace occurred when she needed to write a paper outlining a particular issue. She wrote two documents, one in her natural style and one in a style that she felt would suit an S. She then offered both papers to colleagues and asked for comments, and the one published and issued at work was the S document.

**Boundaries:** From the boundary activity, this INTP found the feedback session when Ian was unable to 'translate' her group's feedback amazing. The fact that a retired professor couldn't deconstruct her feedback and sort it into what she saw as obvious categories astounded her. She didn't say anything although because to her it was too obvious. 'He put everything in one box and I couldn't see him link.'

**Movies activity:** As an NTP she experienced the NJs as dogmatic, which she found most evident in the film activity. 'It was difficult to find a common link at all.' Films for her are not cerebral activities. 'They must be about entertainment and the actual experience is about being happy.'

---

**Observations by the team**

The team held a number of discussions to review the workshop and to try to better understand the dynamics of the group. This was the first time all team members had worked together, and it took us longer to work out details of interactions 'on the run' than we had planned for. While the complexity of using a team of four quite different types was daunting, this feature attracted praise and interest from some participants.

The types most represented in the workshop group were INTJ, INTP and ENFP; the 'group type' was INTP. The nature of this group provided some challenges, but also some understanding of the role group type can play over a one-day workshop. For instance, the group showed some classic development over the day.

In the last activity we concluded that we were forcing some participants to a level of personal disclosure, and several were pushed into operating with their inferior function. Thus we saw behaviours which indicated extraverted feeling and decision-making. In that final activity we saw the group work disintegrate. We had set a very personal topic in a group setting, and many struggled with that. Perhaps it was also the NPs who near the end of the day thought, 'All over, Red Rover', and found it easier to disconnect.

We now believe we had set the groups a task which really should have been done alone: making sense of the whole experience. Participants had to access introverted thinking, but they were all trying to behave in their group type and worked hard to make sense of the 'ESTJ stuff.' This they were not able to do, as the authority figures became dominant in their groups.

The reactions to the movies exercise were interesting, in that they were unexpected. It was clear that for some participants there was a psychological difference between seeing movies on TV and seeing them in theatres. Some immediately said, 'Oh, we don't go to movies!', yet were able to produce titles from their TV viewing.
It also became apparent that some participants did not see any relationship between personal things as responses to films (the data that interest them) and workplace behaviour. One can imagine, however, that many workplace interactions are affected by what workmates say about the things that interest them.

One team member reported that disclosure of her interest in opera produced a strong barrier from some workmates, who subsequently perceived her as snobbish—but opened up a relationship with a workmate who shared that interest.

Another consideration is that the rich flow of data from this exercise was overwhelming at first, with many subtle nuances not immediately indicating the nature of a choice. Ian was certainly overwhelmed with the product and needed more time to digest and analyse it.

But perhaps asking about 'movies that are special to you' elicits some deeper psychological processes, where archetypes and inferior functions come more strongly into play. It is interesting that, in this workshop and also in the earlier one, the session on 'data that interests them' produced some discordant responses. As indicated earlier, it might be desirable to introduce a clearer 'workplace focus' to this activity.

Lastly, we came to face the issue that some participants perhaps had a limited appreciation of what 'experiential learning' was all about. This had been emphasised in our advertising material but probably needed more spelling out. Some participants seemingly wanted the workshop leaders to play more demonstrative roles and provide more structured learning.

We had thought that the processing of what each activity illustrated about differences would stimulate thinking about what strategies might be useful in dealing with the S-N chasm in the workplace. For some this did not readily occur: they appeared to need more prompting and 'telling' by the team. In fact, those participants who had been more ready to explore the meaning of the interactions seemed to gain more from each activity.

Some participants did not see a relationship between responses to films and workplace behaviour

The team wish to acknowledge the willing participation on the day, and to especially thank those who have provided feedback and shared their insights with us.

We believe that the usefulness of exploring communication blocks and differences using the psychological type framework has been demonstrated in our workshop reports.

We thank participants for their willingness to share their learnings with others, and to rise to the challenge of opening previously-untapped communication channels. We enjoyed planning, presenting and thinking about what happened at the workshop—and we hope you did, too.
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While Jung considered the distinction between E and I as the most important of his dimensions of personality, I think of it as least useful in understanding people ...

Indeed, in my view it borders on the trivial compared to S-N ...

David Keirsey, Please Understand Me II

What is it that allows Kelly to make Rick look so abstract, and Rick to make Kelly look so concrete, leaving me in the middle, like an interpreter?

Nick Earls, Bachelor Kisses